Serial No.: 10/741,306
Group Art Unit: 2416
Examiner: Jeffrey M. Rutkowski

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 13-19 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 13 being independent claims. Claims 6-12 were previously canceled. Claims 1 and 13 are currently amended. In the most recent March 18, 2009 final office action and August 18, 2009 advisory action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 13-19 (the only remaining claims) under both 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 103.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection alleges that the specification is non-enabling and indefinite with respect to the meaning of the feature of "redirecting the media to the first device." *See* Office Action, pp. 2-3. However, it is obvious to one skilled in the art reading the specification what this means. The specification makes it clear that "[t]he server further receives media directed to the logical device and redirects the media to the first device." *See* application, p. 3. In other words, the server simply sends the media to the first device as is well known in the art. As with any other undefined words in claims, the words contained in this limitation should simply be given their ordinary and customary meaning to the extent they are not defined.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection further alleges that the meanings of "IP set" and "logical IP set" are non-enabling and indefinite. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-3. However, "IP set" and "logical IP set" are used throughout the specification and drawings of the present application and their meaning is clear.

134132 – Page 6

In reference to FIG. 1, page 8 of the present application states, "telephony devices, such as, for example, digital sets 12, IP sets 14, and SIP sets 16." On page 9 of the present application, applicant states, "[t]he IP sets 14 may take the form of any conventional digital telephony device capable of interfacing with the IP-PBX 10 over the communications network 22 via PDSV-over-IP messages."

Page 10 of the present application in relevant part states:

> In order to reconcile the differences in the master-slave and peer-to-peer modes of handling media flows and properly interface the IP-PBX 10 to the SIP network, the SIP-PBX proxy server 18 maintains a logical IP set 24 for each SIP set 16 on the SIP network that maintains IP based signaling and media connectivity with the IP-PBX 10. The logical IP sets 24 implement operations, such as handshaking and firmware download, typically implemented by physical IP sets.

FIG. 1 further shows a separate logical IP set 24 for each SIP set 16. In combination, these various sections of the application make it clear what is meant by the terms "logical IP set" and "IP set" and the differences between them.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

In the First Office Action, independent Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Gallant (US 2002/0131575). Applicants amended Claim 1 to include the "server maintaining for *each of said* at least one of the first devices a *separate* logical device adhering to the first protocol" (emphasis added) limitation, support for which could be found at least in reference to Figure 1, elements 24 and page 10, the last paragraph of the present

invention.   In contrast, the Examiner set forth that Gallant disclosed a single "logical device"

(Fig. 4, Box 16) affiliated with PBX 14.

In the Final Office Action, Examiner maintained the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC

103(a), stating that Claim 1 was unpatentable over Gallant in view of Sternagle (US

2002/0184376). Examiner asserted that Gallant disclosed all of the limitations of Claim 1 except

maintaining separate logical devices.   *See* Final Office Action, p. 3.   Examiner alleges that

Sternagle teaches a single device with multiple SIP devices within it.   However, this is not the

equivalent of "the server maintaining for each of said at least one of the first devices a separate

logical device adhering to the first protocol" limitation of Claim 1.

Page 10 of the present application in relevant part states:

> In order to reconcile the differences in the master-slave and peer-
> to-peer modes of handling media flows and properly interface the
> IP-PBX 10 to the SIP network, the SIP-PBX proxy server 18
> maintains a logical IP set 24 for each SIP set 16 on the SIP
> network that maintains IP based signaling and media connectivity
> with the IP-PBX 10.

FIG. 1 also shows in detail that there is a separate logical IP set in the proxy server for

each SIP set.

Paragraph 29 of Sternagle in relevant part states:

> SIP signaling router 200 includes a plurality of cluster nodes 202
> that perform SIP protocol functions.   For example, cluster nodes
> 202 may comprise SIP proxy servers, SIP redirect servers, or
> combination proxy/redirect server.   An active location server 204
> maintains a database of SIP location information and replicates the
> database to SIP cluster nodes 202 and to a standby location server
> 206.   Standby location server 206 provides a redundant copy of the
> SIP location database maintained by active location server 204 in
> the event of failure of active location server 204.   Management
> node 208 performs network management functions and other
> services, such as domain name system (DNS) service, dynamic

134132 — Page 8

host configuration protocol (DHCP) service, and trivial file transfer protocol (TFTP) service.

While it is true that Sternagle discloses a single device with multiple SIP devices within it as disclosed above, this is not the equivalent of "the server maintaining for each of said at least one of the first devices a separate logical device adhering to the first protocol." FIG. 1 of the present application, the relevant discussion pertaining to that figure discussed herein and previously amended Claim 1 reveal that there is a separate logical IP set in the proxy server for each SIP set and not a single device with multiple SIP devices or a SIP signaling router that includes a plurality of cluster nodes that perform SIP protocol functions as discussed in Sternagle. No disclosure in any of the cited references shows a server maintaining for *each* of said at least one of the first devices a *separate* logical device adhering to the first protocol.

In the most recent March 18, 2009 office action, Examiner indicates that the "state machines" of United States Patent No. 7,058,082 ("Bhat") are the equivalent of the logical IP sets of independent claims 1 and 13. However, the "state machines" of Bhat do not perform the same function as the logical IP sets of the present invention. Namely, they do not "implement operations, such as handshaking and firmware download, typically implemented by physical IP sets." Independent Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to clarify this distinction.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 2-5, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 14-19, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 13, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for

the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 13, Applicants respectfully assert

that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Serial No.: 10/741,306
Group Art Unit: 2416
Examiner: Jeffrey M. Rutkowski

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment and response places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned at 512-306-8533.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Raymond M. Galasso
Reg. No. 37,832

Correspondence Address:
Alcatel Lucent
c/o Galasso & Associates, LP
P.O. Box 26503
Austin, Texas 78755-0503
(512) 306-8533 telephone
(512) 306-8559 fax

134132 – Page 11